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A. Interpretation – economic engagement requires expanding bilateral economic relations

Kahler, 6 - Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego (M., "Strategic Uses of Economic Interdependence: Engagement Policies on the Korean Peninsula and Across the Taiwan Strait" in Journal of Peace Research (2006), 43:5, p. 523-541, Sage Publications)

Economic engagement - a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and improve bilateral political relations - is a subject of growing interest in international relations. Most research on economic statecraft emphasizes coercive policies such as economic sanctions. This emphasis on negative forms of economic statecraft is not without justification: the use of economic sanctions is widespread and well documented, and several quantitative studies have shown that adversarial relations between countries tend to correspond to reduced, rather than enhanced, levels of trade (Gowa, 1994; Pollins, 1989). At the same time, however, relatively little is known about how often strategies of economic engagement are deployed: scholars disagree on this point, in part because no database cataloging instances of positive economic statecraft exists (Mastanduno, 2003). Beginning with the classic work of Hirschman (1945), most studies of economic engagement have been limited to the policies of great powers (Mastanduno, 1992; Davis, 1999; Skalnes, 2000; Papayoanou %26 Kastner, 1999/2000; Copeland, 1999/2000; Abdelal %26 Kirshner, 1999/2000). However, engagement policies adopted by South Korea and one other state examined in this study, Taiwan, demonstrate that engagement is not a strategy limited to the domain of great power politics and that it may be more widespread than previously recognized.

This means the plan has to be government-to-government – not private economic engagement

Daga, 13 - director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, in Bolivia, and a visiting senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation (Sergio, "Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic:

U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela", National Center for Policy Analysis, 5/15, [[http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message\_to\_Debaters\_6-7-13.pdf-http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message\_to\_Debaters\_6-7-13.pdf]])

Economic engagement between or among countries can take many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic engagement with private economic engagement through 3) international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with respect to some countries than to others.

~’Its~’ is a possessive pronoun showing ownership

Glossary of English Grammar Terms, 2005

(http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html)

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive pronouns used to substitute a noun and to show possession or ownership.

EG. This is your disk and that~’s mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

B. Violation – the plan targets civil society and doesn~’t engage with government

C. Voting issue –

1. limits – a government limit is the only way to keep the topic manageable – otherwise they could use any 3^^rd^^ party intermediary, lift barriers to private engagement, or target civil society – it makes topic preparation impossible

2. negative ground – formal governmental channels are key to predictable relations disads and counterplans that test ~’engagement~’

Politics DA Syria

The Syria authorization will pass but it will be a tough fight - capital is key to GOP support

Cohen, 9/3/13 (Tom, "Syria war resolution faces tough challenge in Congress" CNN,

[[http://www.cnn.com/2013/09/03/politics/obama-syria-congress/-http://www.cnn.com/2013/09/03/politics/obama-syria-congress/]])

To Darrell West, the vice president and director of governance studies at the Brookings Institution, support from the House is the biggest challenge for Obama. "There are very few moderates that are left and it~’s a highly polarized institution," he noted, adding that what amounts to a war authorization vote was likely to shake up the normal partisan line in Congress. "You could have libertarian Republicans joining liberal Democrats to vote no, just because they~’re tired of foreign adventures," West said. "It may come down to Republicans who support a strong foreign policy joining forces with Democratic moderates to give approval." A new ABC News/Washington Post poll released Tuesday showed that nearly six in 10 Americans oppose military strikes against Syria, with similar results from respondents identifying themselves as Democrats and Republicans. The administration has launched what it calls a "flood the zone" lobbying effort to persuade legislators to support the resolution authorizing military strikes against Syria. This effort in Washington includes classified briefings, testimony of Cabinet members at committee hearings, and meetings with the president. Mindful of concerns that a strike on Syria will lead to a prolonged engagement, Obama said Tuesday that "this is not Iraq, and this is not Afghanistan." "This is a limited, proportional step that will send a clear message — not only to the Assad regime, but also to other countries that may be interested in testing some of these international norms — that there are consequences," the president said. At the hearing by the Senate panel he used to chair, Secretary of State John Kerry later said that "neither our country nor our conscience can afford the cost of silence." However, Obama departs on Tuesday night on a four-day trip to Sweden and Russia at a time when members of both parties clamor for him to be directly involved. With congressional elections next year, many legislators feel that the safe vote on Syria right now is to oppose the Obama resolution, CNN Chief National Correspondent John King said Tuesday. "The president has to sway and the most important people he~’ll meet with today are the House Republicans," King said. "He doesn~’t have good relationships with them, very few personal relationships with them. They don~’t trust him. They don~’t support most of his other policy initiatives." Speaking before Boehner and Cantor publicly backed Obama, King said the president needed the House GOP leadership to "lobby their own members, saying this is the right thing to do even if you don~’t agree with the president." Cantor~’s statement did just that, even taking on a popular GOP talking point that Obama had erred by previously declaring chemical weapons use a "red line" that would bring a U.S. response if Syrian President Bashar al-Assad crossed it. "The United States~’ broader policy goal, as articulated by the president, is that Assad should go, and President Obama~’s red line is consistent with that goal and with the goal of deterring the use of weapons of mass destruction," Cantor said in the statement. "It is the type of red line virtually any American president would draw." However, Boehner~’s spokesman, Michael Steel, made clear that the speaker was leaving it to Obama to persuade legislators to support him. "It is the president~’s responsibility to make his case to the American people and their elected representatives," Steel said in a statement, adding that "all votes authorizing the use of military force are conscience votes for members, and passage will require direct, continuous engagement from the White House." Obama met Monday with two veteran Republican senators — John McCain of Arizona and Lindsey Graham of South Carolina — who emerged to say they could support a more precise and robust strategy than the president initially outlined. In particular, McCain and Graham said Obama pledged increased military aid to opposition forces in Syria that would bolster their fight against al-Assad at the same time as U.S. military attacks expected to to involve cruise missile strikes on Syrian military command targets. After Obama met Tuesday with Boehner, Pelosi and the chairs of several national security committees in Congress, legislators from both parties said they expected the initial resolution proposed by the president to be revised to address their concerns. In particular, they said it would define the mission more narrowly and specify no "boots on the ground," which means no U.S. troops would be deployed to Syria. West noted that no matter what lobbying takes place, "there are some Republicans who will vote ~’no~’ just because the idea came from President Obama" because "they detest everything he stands for." Moderates, meanwhile, may face the prospect of a primary challenge from the more extremist wing of their respective party if they authorize a war resolution, he said. "Anti-war sentiment remains very strong within the Democratic Party," West said, noting that grass-roots activists on the left opposed the Iraq war at the height of post 9/11 patriotic fervor. "The idea of another foreign intervention would be of great concern to those people." In the end, West said he expects Obama~’s resolution to win approval because "the president has laid national prestige on the line." However, a House GOP leadership aide told CNN that "it is going to be a big lift to get this done." "We~’re only going to be able to help the president as much as he~’s willing to help himself," the aide said on condition of not being identified, noting Obama must be personally involved, make the case for military action and "prove that we have a military plan that will work and not drag us into the mud for a long time."

New Latin American economic engagement initiatives cause a massive loss in political capital

\*\*Isacson, 11\*\*

Adam, Senior Associate @ WOLA, Washington Office on Latin America, Areas of Expertise: Regional and Military Security Policy, Arms Transfers, Civil-Military Relations, Colombia, International Drug Policy, Mexico, Peace Processes, U.S. Assistance, Adam Isacson is a key member of WOLA~’s Regional Security Policy team. He is a leading expert on defense, civil-military relations, and U.S. security assistance to the Americas. He collaborates on Just the Facts—a constantly updated source of information and analysis of the United States~’ often troubled relationship with Latin America~’s militaries. He helped found Just the Facts in the early 1990s. Mr. Isacson has co-authored dozens of publications, including "Ready, Aim, Foreign Policy" and "Waiting for Change," which examine the increasing role of the military in U.S. foreign policy. During the 2000s, Mr. Isacson focused on Colombia, the principal destination of U.S. aid to Latin America at the time. At the end of the decade, he published "Don~’t Call It a Model," a comprehensive look at the lessons to be learned from Plan Colombia. He has testified before Congress on international drug policy, Colombia~’s conflict, U.S. military aid programs and human rights, and has organized several congressional delegations to the region. He is "among the few in Washington who genuinely affect how policy-makers in Congress and the administration shape their decisions and policy proposals," says a congressional staffer who closely follows Latin America policy. He is known for his pithy commentary, shared online daily through regular contributions to Just the Facts and other blogs. Among Latin America analysts, he has been a leader in cutting-edge use of technology for transparency, instant analysis, and advocacy. Mr. Isacson joined WOLA in 2010 after fourteen years working on Latin American and Caribbean security issues with the Center for International Policy (CIP). Before WOLA and CIP, he worked for the Arias Foundation for Peace and Human Progress in San José, Costa Rica as a program assistant for demilitarization. 3/10, http://www.wola.org/commentary/president\_obama\_s\_upcoming\_trip\_to\_latin\_america

Though Latin Americans~’ perceptions of the United States have improved since a low point during the Bush administration, our country is no longer the central player in the economic lives of most Latin American countries, either through trade or aid. As a result, it carries much less political weight. Though it is not his intention, President Obama~’s trip will underscore that the era of unquestioned U.S. leadership has ended, as the President himself acknowledged at the 2009 Summit of the Americas, when he emphasized building an "equal partnership" with the region~’s states. In this new reality, the White House has made an astute choice of countries to visit. Each carries great symbolic value. • In Brazil, President Obama~’s discussions with President Dilma Rousseff will highlight the global power and influence of South America~’s rapidly growing giant. It may also mark a notable improvement in the tone of U.S. relations with Rousseff~’s government, which assumed power in January. • In both Brazil and Chile, President Obama will recognize the success of long, difficult transitions from military dictatorship to democracy. Both countries are still trying to uncover the truth about the mass human rights abuses committed before those transitions began, and to hold the worst abusers accountable. The President would do well to acknowledge these important efforts. • In El Salvador, the President will be commemorating a successful transition from all-out civil war to stable peace, with a democracy so healthy that, following its 2009 elections, it underwent a smooth transition of power to the opposition: the party of the former guerrilla insurgency. President Obama~’s trip is also important for what it is not "about." This is not a visit driven by U.S. threat perceptions. Except for where it touches discussions of public security and organized crime, drugs — and the U.S. "war" on them — are not on the agenda. Nor should we expect much discussion of terrorism, Iran or even Venezuela. The focus on opportunities instead of threats is very welcome. Not all of the messages will be positive, however. In a time of reduced power and deep budget cuts, President Obama will be arriving largely empty-handed. There is relatively little new economic aid to offer; much of what the Administration can propose is re-programming to meet priority needs, improved coordination, and technical assistance. These are important, but not a substitute for new assistance and new initiatives. Not only can we expect few offers of new economic aid, we can expect few commitments to spend substantial political capital. The administration, though supportive, is unlikely to make a major political commitment to help Latin America address what, according to opinion polls throughout the region, are its main concerns: public security, unemployment, weak institutions, and migration. While crime and violence will be mentioned in Brazil and El Salvador, the most President Obama is likely to offer is a commitment to maintain modest existing levels of assistance for police and judicial institution-building. On the economy and jobs, the President will visit Chile and Brazil, whose growth rates dwarf our own. In his visit to El Salvador, whose economy is only beginning to recover from the financial crisis that hit the United States, the President is likely to support targeted anti-poverty efforts, but no major new initiatives. Strengthening institutions requires supporting reformers both in government and civil society, including human rights defenders and leaders of unions and social movements — something on which the U.S. record is mixed. On migration — a third-rail political issue in today~’s Washington — we can expect little. (El Salvador seeks a long-term resolution of the status of the two hundred thousand Salvadorans still here on a "temporary protected" basis, but no immediate solution is at hand.) We will hear words like "partnership" and "engagement" used quite heavily and repeatedly in the course of this trip. This is certainly the right tone to take. But those words have little meaning, though, if they don~’t come with a commitment to expend resources — both political and financial — to help our "partners" address their own concerns, even if it occasionally displeases a domestic political constituency. True partners are also willing to admit when their policies are not working, rather than forge blindly ahead as we have done in Cuba, the drug war, our trade policy and elsewhere. Latin America no longer revolves around the U.S. "sun," and our policy toward the region can no longer act as though it does. Let~’s hope that the tone and content of the President~’s visit reflect that.

Capital is finite and Syria requires all of it – the plan burns his leverage and consumes docket time and energy

Brown, 9/4/13 (Carrie, Politico, "Obama~’s capital spreads thin"

[[http://m.politico.com/iphone/story/0913/96306.html-http://m.politico.com/iphone/story/0913/96306.html]])

\*

President Barack Obama faced a heavy lift in Congress this fall when his agenda included only budget issues and immigration reform. Now with Syria in the mix, the president appears ready to spend a lot of the political capital that he would have kept in reserve for his domestic priorities. A resolution authorizing the use of force in Syria won~’t make it through the House or the Senate without significant cajoling from the White House. That means Obama, who struggles to get Congress to follow his lead on almost everything, could burn his limited leverage convincing Democrats and Republicans to vote for an unpopular military operation that even the president says he could carry out with or without their approval. "The only effect is — and I don~’t mean this to be dismissive in any way — it will be taking up some time and there be some degree of political capital expended by all," said Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), the Foreign Relations Committee ranking member who helped draft the Senate resolution. "At the end of the day, it~’s a tough vote for anybody because the issue is trying to draft an authorization knowing that they~’re going to implement it." The West Wing says it~’s too early to know how Obama~’s surprise decision to seek congressional authorization will affect the rest of his agenda, but his advisers are betting that a win could usher in other domestic successes. A failed vote, however, would undoubtedly weaken him. A senior administration official said the effort could build some trust between the White House and Republicans that might ease tensions in negotiations over the budget and other issues. White House aides have long argued that success begets success. Their latest test of that theory was the broad bipartisan Senate vote for comprehensive immigration reform bill, which was supposed to compel the House to act. So far, it has not — and House Republicans don~’t think the Syria vote will be any different. "The idea that passing the authorization for use of military force in Syria would give the administration more leverage in future political debates is absurd," one senior GOP leadership aide said. "They are currently spending political capital they don~’t have." No matter how it plays out, the sudden emergence of a fight over Syria presents both political and logistical challenges for Congress and the White House. House Republicans were already grumbling about the prospect of several perilous votes this fall — first on raising the debt limit and extending government funding, then on a package of reforms to the immigration system. White House aides began hearing skepticism from Republican leaders that they could force a debt limit hike through the chamber and then press for passage of even a pared-back immigration bill. Adding a vote on military intervention in Syria could create even more friction between the Obama administration and House Republicans, as lawmakers are being put in a position of potentially voting against their party leaders. House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) are backing Obama, but the vast majority of the conference appears to oppose the resolution, at least at this point. And even before Syria took over the headlines, there was very little time on the congressional calendar to address those issues — as well as the confirmation of the yet-to-be-nominated Federal Reserve chairman. As much as Obama likes to say the White House and Congress should "be able to walk and chew gum at the same time," often they cannot.

A failed Syria vote spurs global appeasement, allied prolif, nuclear use and shreds U.S. primacy

Cohen, 9/2/13 - teaches at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. From 2007-08 he served as counselor of the State Department (Eliot, "The Stakes on the Syria Vote" Wall Street Journal, [[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324432404579049261525066516.html-http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324432404579049261525066516.html]])

\*conclusions drawn by China (already ok with bullying opponents), North Korea, Iran (already engaged in war with) on US stance about chem weapons \*allies see US word as useless- acquire nucs b/c US sec no longer enough

On Saturday, when President Obama overruled his advisers, reversed his own policy and declared that he would not act against Syria until Congress has had its say, he did not—as he might have—recall Congress for that purpose. Instead, Mr. Obama said he would let the vote wait for 10 days or more. Then he promptly left the White House for the golf course. Later this week, he~’ll travel to Stockholm and then to St. Petersburg, Russia, for a G-20 economic summit. Mr. Obama~’s dwindling band of defenders insist that this decision "to seek authorization for the use of force from the American people~’s representatives in Congress" was a matter of principle which had escaped him in Libya in 2011, and that only occurred to him now after many days of plotting an air campaign against the Syrian government for its use of chemical weapons. Others, less charitably inclined, see in his Saturday announcement a mixture of unworthy motives—an outright panic when British Prime Minister David Cameron lost a war vote in the House of Commons; an unbecoming wish that Congress would give him an excuse for inaction; and an unworthy scheme to stick his enemies (as he understands them) in Congress with a responsibility he hopes to shirk. It is beside the point to assess these motives. Congress now has decisions to make. This is the argument that lies before them. The case against authorizing the use of force begins with an indictment of the administration~’s feckless policy toward Syria. Mr. Obama chose passivity two years ago when he might have tipped the balance to a then largely secular opposition. He concocted and then ignored red lines regarding the use of chemical weapons. And he has, with this latest backflip, shown himself eager to squirm out of his own commitments, even as the rhetoric of his pronouncements ("limited," "tailored," "no boots on the ground," etc.) indicates far more interest in what the U.S. will not do than what it should do, and why. The president~’s critics will further note, and correctly, that war is war, and, as such, unpredictable. As Winston Churchill put it: "Never, never, never believe any war will be smooth and easy, or that anyone who embarks on that strange voyage can measure the tides and hurricanes he will encounter." Despite Mr. Obama~’s statements about narrowly defined goals, precise uses of force and limited duration, it is entirely reasonable to expect that such a strange voyage may lie ahead once operations begin, and that he is singularly ill-fitted to navigate it. Finally, as a practical matter, critics can ask why the U.S. should intervene after a massacre, however hideous, of some 1,400 Syrians, when America has refused to act over the slaughter of 100,000 in the preceding two years. And, even if the U.S. strikes at Assad and helps bring about his downfall, the danger is real that having administered a defeat to the regime and its sponsor, Iran, America will hand a victory to al Qaeda. These are all serious arguments. But weightier are the counterarguments. For better or for worse, the credibility not only of this president, but of America as a global power and a guarantor of international order, is on the line. If the U.S.—after its president said two years ago that Assad must go and then, a year later, drew a red line at Syria~’s use of chemical weapons—now does nothing, profound conclusions will be drawn by a China ready to bully its neighbors, by a North Korea whose scruples are already minimal, and by an Iran that has already killed many Americans in a covert war waged against us in Iraq and Afghanistan. America~’s friends will realize that its word means nothing. As a result, they will either abandon us, or arm themselves with nuclear weapons. And these countries will be increasingly willing to wield them in a world in which they have no great ally who may be counted upon to stand by them in an hour of need. One has to suspect that the Syrian government deliberately used sarin in the Damascus suburbs while United Nations inspectors were in the capital, and on the eve of the anniversary of Mr. Obama~’s red line statement. The essence of tyranny is this message to a population: "We will impose our will on you. No one cares about your suffering, and no one will do anything to rescue you." Assad~’s message was delivered by chemical weapons of mass destruction. Civilized nations let that message remain unanswered at their peril. The U.S. now faces a twofold problem. The first is that many Americans who came of age in the past 25 years, having grown up in a world that has been shaped by U.S. primacy, take that primacy and the stability and prosperity it has brought for granted. They should not. It hangs in the balance.

Extinction

\*\*Barnett 11\*\* (Thomas, Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis %26 Research Department, worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, "The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads," The World Politics Review, March 7, 2011, [[http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads-http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads]])

\*after 20^^th^^ century, decline in empires, increase in dem and HR \*99% decline in deaths (WWI and WWII killed about 2 million people)

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world~’s sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don~’t know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence — in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment~’s most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We~’ll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it~’s entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, and a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world~’s most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let~’s examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization — one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding. As a result, the vector of structure-building connectivity shifted from trans-Atlantic to trans-Pacific. But if the connectivity push of the past several decades has been from West to East, with little connectivity extended to the South outside of the narrow trade of energy and raw materials, the current connectivity dynamic is dramatically different. Now, the dominant trends are: first, the East cross-connecting back to the West via financial and investment flows as well as Asian companies "going global"; and second, the East creating vast new connectivity networks with the South through South-South trade and investment. The challenge here is how to adjust great-power politics to these profound forces of structural change. Because of the West~’s connectivity to the East, we are by extension becoming more deeply connected to the unstable South, with China as the primary conduit. Meanwhile, America~’s self-exhausting post-Sept. 11 unilateralist bender triggered the illusion — all the rage these days — of a G-Zero, post-American world. The result, predictably enough for manic-depressive America, is that we~’ve sworn off any overall responsibility for the South, even as we retain the right to go anywhere and kill any individuals — preferably with flying robots — that we deem immediately threatening to our narrowly defined national security interests. The problem with this approach is that China has neither the intention nor the ability to step up and play anything resembling a responsible Leviathan over the restive South, where globalization~’s advance — again, with a Chinese face — produces a lot of near-term instability even as it builds the basis for longer-term stability. Libya is a perfect example of where the world is now stuck: America is very reticent to get involved militarily, while China, for the first time in its history, engages in long-range military operations to evacuate its workforce there. Meanwhile, the expanding civil war rages on, to everyone~’s moral and economic distress. The point is not that America must invade Libya pronto to keep the world as we know it from coming to an end. But if the United States and the West sit by while the Rest, risers that they are, manage nothing more than pious warnings about needlessly butting in, then we all run the risk of collectively making the post-American, G-Zero, do-nothing storyline a self-fulfilling prophecy. While that alone won~’t stop the world from spinning, if it persists as a pattern, globalization will slide down another path: one of regionalism, spheres of influence and neocolonial burdens that are intuitively hoarded by great powers grown increasingly suspicious of one another. And if you know your history, that should make you nervous.

Spending DA

Government spending is low and the economy is growing

IMT, 6/3 – (Industry Market Trends, "Weekly Industry Crib Sheet: U.S. Economy up Despite Drop in Government Spending", ThomasNet, 6/3/13, [[http://news.thomasnet.com/IMT/2013/06/03/weekly-industry-crib-sheet-u-s-economy-up-despite-drop-in-government-spending/-http://news.thomasnet.com/IMT/2013/06/03/weekly-industry-crib-sheet-u-s-economy-up-despite-drop-in-government-spending/]]) // EK

The first quarter Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was revised up last week to a 2.4 percent annual growth rate. The increase is slightly less than economists~’ predictions of 2.5 percent. The modest growth is due to a rise in many indicators, including consumer spending, residential construction, and stock prices. Despite the growth, all is not good news.¶ Consumer spending, which accounts for 70 percent of economic activity as measured by GDP, was up 3.4 percent, beating expectations. Residential construction increased 22.1 percent. CBS News attributed the boost to a rise in new jobs, reporting that companies added 208,000 jobs per month on average since November 2012. This is well above the 138,000 average during the previous six months.¶ Corporate profits were up 3.6 percent from the same period last year, but fell 2.2 percent in the first quarter overall.¶ Government spending was also down. This is the 10th time spending dropped in the last 11 quarters. Federal spending declined 8.7 percent in the first quarter, compared with 14.8 percent in the fourth quarter last year. Defense spending also dropped by 12.1 percent.¶ Based on this and further pending budget cuts, economists are now predicting only 2 percent growth in

Foreign aid has recently received budget cuts – any substantial increase triggers the link

Lieberman 11 – reporter for Reuters (Susan, "U.S. foreign aid escapes slashing cuts in fiscal 2012", Reuters, 12/19/11, [[http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/12/19/us-usa-aid-idUSTRE7BI1KO20111219)//js-http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/12/19/us-usa-aid-idUSTRE7BI1KO20111219)/js]]

Foreign aid not related to war spending was cut by %242.2 billion from 2011. The budget for operational costs of the State Department and related agencies was slashed %242.6 billion from last year, and operations at the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) were cut by %24258 million from 2011. For the second year in a row, the pay of U.S. foreign service officers was frozen. The 2012 spending plan is a mixed bag, said Liz Schrayer, the executive director of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, which advocates for diplomacy and development aid. "In the short term, we are pleased the agreement avoids the deep and disproportionate cuts to these programs from earlier versions of the bill ... However, in the long-run, the cuts to funding for non-war related program is of grave concern given the challenges and turbulence in the world today."

New spending destroys the economy – research is conclusive

Boccia 2/13 - an economist, is Assistant Director for the Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation. She holds a master~’s degree in Economics at George Mason University (Romina, "How the United States~’ High Debt Will Weaken the Economy and Hurt Americans", Heritage Foundation, 2/13/13, [[http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/02/how-the-united-states-high-debt-will-weaken-the-economy-and-hurt-americans)//js-http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/02/how-the-united-states-high-debt-will-weaken-the-economy-and-hurt-americans)/js]]

U.S. federal spending in 2013, combined with depressed receipts from a weak economy, is on track to result in a deficit of %24850 billion. Publicly held debt in the United States will exceed 76 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) in 2013, and chronic deficits are projected to push U.S. debt to 87 percent of the economy in 10 years.~~[1~~] Debt is projected to grow even more rapidly after 2023. Recent economic research, especially the work of Carmen Reinhart, Vincent Reinhart, and Kenneth Rogoff, confirms that federal debt at such high levels puts the United States at risk for a number of harmful economic consequences, including slower economic growth, a weakened ability to respond to unexpected challenges, and quite possibly a debt-driven financial crisis.~~[2~~] The federal government is quickly exhausting its ability to manage its bills, with debt having already reached the statutory debt ceiling. The resulting debate should focus on the need to reduce federal spending immediately and over the long term by making necessary and prudent reforms to the nation~’s major entitlement programs, and thus reduce the continued buildup of debt and the expected harmful consequences increasingly confirmed by academic research.

Economic decline causes great power war

Royal, 10 – Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense (Jedediah, Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modclski and Thompson~’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon. 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland~’s (1996. 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ~’future expectation of trade~’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg %26 Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg. Hess. %26 Weerapana. 2004). which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ~’Diversionary theory~’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a ~’rally around the flag~’ effect. Wang (1990, DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.~’ This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

China CP

Text: The People~’s Republic of China should substantially increase its economic engagement toward Mexico through funding non-profit non- governmental organizations engaged in micro-financing.

The CP competes and solves the case – China offers a unique model of economic engagement.

\*\*Hsiang 09\*\* (Antonio C. Hsiang, Associate Professor at Chihlee Institute of Technology in Taiwan China Rising in Latin America: More Opportunities than Challenges" Journal of Emerging Knowledge on Emerging Markets, Volume 1 issue 1 November 2009)-Karla

Because "many Latin American countries no longer look to Washington leadership," the so- called Washington Consensus "has lost traction".28 As a global rising power, China offers an alternative model for Latin America~’s development. Even though China has been hurt by the 2008 financial crisis, "its economic and financial powers have been strengthened relative to those of the West. China~’s global influence will thus increase, and Beijing will be able to undertake political and economic initiatives to increase it further." 29 In fact, "Washington seemed to adopt a Chinese-style solution to its escalating financial problems: greater state intervention to restrict the movement of capital."30 Thus, Beijing~’s emergence as a global economic power is seen throughout Latin America as offering an alternative from the Washington Consensus model for economic development. The "Beijing Consensus" is the brainchild of Joshua Cooper Ramo, a former senior editor and foreign editor of Time magazine and later a partner at Kissinger Associates, the consulting firm of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. According to Ramo, the Beijing Consensus has three features. The first is a commitment to innovation and constant experimentation in reforms. The second, a rejection of per capita GDP as the only measure of progress, as sustainability and equality also count. And the third, a commitment to self- determination. Less developed countries should therefore ensure their own financial integrity and keep great powers in check. 31 The Beijing Consensus has evolved to describe a plethora of alternative plans for economic development in the underdeveloped world. Ramo argues that China and India, who "most pointedly" ignored the World Bank and the IMF-championed Washington Consensus, "now have records that speak for themselves." 32 Consequently, the so-called the "Beijing Consensus" has been attracting attention in Latin America because of "China~’s distinctive development model, . . . ~~[which~~] posits far more state intervention in the economy and a greater concern with political stability and strong government to guide the development process." 33

Mexico says yes to China- bilateral relations opening up investment

\*\*MERCOPRESS 6/7\*\*, ~~[MercoPress is an independent news agency which focuses on delivering news related to Mercosur-member countries, covering an area of influence which includes the South Atlantic and insular territories.~~] Mexico and China leave behind mistrust and agree on strategic partnership, http://en.mercopress.com/2013/06/07/mexico-and-china-leave-behind-mistrust-and-agree-on-strategic-partnership

Xi pointed out that China and Mexico have just agreed to upgrade their bilateral relations to a comprehensive strategic partnership, which creates more favourable conditions and opens a vaster space for the development of trade and economic cooperation. The Chinese president urged both sides to see each other as partners and an important opportunity for development, and to strengthen China-Mexico economic and trade cooperation from a strategic perspective. Xi said that the two countries should foster new growth points for bilateral investment in such areas as energy, mining, infrastructure and high-tech industry, while tapping the full potential of their cooperation in traditional fields. "The two sides should work in the spirit of mutual respect and mutual benefit to optimize their trade structure, resolve their differences through amicable negotiations and seek trade balance in an active manner", he said. Addressing the same conference, Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto said China is an important partner for Mexico, and the upgrade of bilateral ties to comprehensive strategic partnership has opened broad prospects for economic and trade cooperation between the two countries. He said the two countries should explore new areas and new means of cooperation so as to promote a more balanced growth of bilateral trade and achieve win-win results. Mexico is willing to create favourable conditions to attract more Chinese investment, he pledged.

=1NC Gender=

War is the root of gender violence—it~’s more productive to focus on preventing war

Goldstein 2001 – IR professor at American University (Joshoue, War and Gender, p. 412, Google Books)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, "if you want peace, work for justice." Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps. among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars~’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.9 So, "if you want peace, work for peace." Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to "reverse women~’s oppression." The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book~’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

Feminist explanations of international violence are too broad to be theoretically useful–realism is the only alternative

\*\*Lind 2005\*\* (Michael, Executive Editor of the National Interest, "Of Arms and the Woman," Jan 20, http://feminism.eserver.org/of-arms-and-the-woman.txt)

Though realist theory can survive, and perhaps even accommodate, many of the arguments of feminism with respect to collective conflict and state sovereignty, realism must reject the third aspect of the feminist criticism: the redefinition of security to mean social justice. From the Marxist left, feminists have picked up the argument that interstate violence is just one genre of "structural violence," which includes the economic oppression of lower classes by upper classes (Marxism) and the subordination of women to men by custom and by violence (feminism). But this notion merely disguises a change of subject as a change of approach. To say that mass rape by soldiers in wartime and wife-beating in societies at peace (excuse me, at "peace") are parts of the same phenomenon is to abandon any pretense of engaging in serious thinking about international relations. The result may be feminist theory, but it is not a theory of world politics. It is a theory of human society in general. When, as in "ecofeminism," the mistreatment of women by men in all societies, in peace and at war, is fused, as a subject of analysis, with the mistreatment of the ecosystem by humanity, one has a theory of everything, and a theory of everything is usually not very much.

Empirial evidence disproves their conflict claims

Nakaya, UNIFEM, 2003 (Sumie, Global Governance, Oct-Dec, ebsco)

Yet the premise of women~’s participation as an introduction to gender equality and sustainable peace agreements has not been tested; it is not backed by empirical evidence. In fact, the short- to medium-term results of many peace processes point to the contrary: women continue to be discriminated against and marginalized in postwar society. In Kosovo, despite the introduction of 30 percent electoral quotas for women, only 8.2 percent of those elected to the Municipal Assemblies in the October 2000 elections were women.~~[sup9~~] In Burundi, despite the historic convention of the All-Party Women~’s Conference in July 2000 in which two women from each of nineteen political parties participating in peace negotiations, formulated women~’s recommendations, and managed to incorporate twenty-three of them into the final peace agreement, conference-goers could not agree on which one delegate would represent them at the accord signing. To date, the role of women in the implementation of the accord has been minimal.~~[sup10~~] In Guatemala, Cambodia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, women~’s representation in parliament has decreased from prewar levels. With international financial institutions advocating the downsizing of the civil service, women are often the last and the least favored in obtaining public sector employment.

Even upon quick inspection, these shortcomings may not be accountable to women and their role at the peace table. Patriarchic traditions, gender-discriminatory state structures, the lack of incentives on the part of fighting parties to commit to peace processes, or the unavailability of national and international resources to implement agreements may be beyond the scope of what women can bring to the peace process. What is, then, the exact nature and impact of "contributions" that women bring to the peace process? Is it the creation of a reconciliatory environment for negotiated settlements, or has it influenced the political processes in which peace agreements are implemented? And if evidence does support that women~’s participation in peace processes promotes social transformation, which entails gender equality and sustainable peace, what would be the mechanism of such change?

Our disad turns the case—the public and governments won~’t accept feminism in times of war

Bunch, Executive Director of the Center for Women~’s Global Leadership at Douglass College, Rutgers, 2003 (Charlotte, Canadian Woman Studies 22 n.2, Fall/Winter 2002-2003, firstsearch)

    Efforts to advance peace and the concept of human security were set back by the events of September 11th and the ensuing resurgence of the masculine dominated discourse on defense. Media response to this crisis proved a rude reminder that when it comes to issues of terrorism, war, and national security, feminism is not on the map. There was rich discussion about these events among women on the internet, but public commentary in the Western media was dominated by male "authority" figures. Even the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson, one of the first to frame a response to 9/11 from the perspective of international law by suggesting justice for this act of terrorism be pursued internationally as crimes against humanity, rather than as a call to war, was quickly side-lined by the U.S. and the United Nations.